

**ARIZONA STATE PARKS BOARD
COUNCIL CHAMBERS, CITY OF YUMA
ONE CITY PLAZA, YUMA, AZ
NOVEMBER 17, 2005
MINUTES**

Board Members Present

Elizabeth Stewart
William Porter
John Hays
William Scalzo

Board Members Absent

William Cordasco
Janice Chilton
Mark Winkleman

Staff Members Present

Ken Travous, Executive Director
Jay Ream, Assistant Director, Parks
Jay Ziemann, Assistant Director, Partnerships and External Affairs
Debi Busser, Executive Secretary
Michael Freisinger, Museum Curator
Carol Griffith, SHPO
John Larner, Exhibits Coordinator
Gerry Emert, Park Manager, Yuma Crossing State Historic Park
Jesse Torres, Park Manager, Yuma Territorial Prison State Historic Park
Carol Griffith, Deputy Director, SHPO
Mary Estes, Site Steward Coordinator

Attorney General's Office

Joy Hernbrode, Assistant Attorney General

A. CALL TO ORDER - ROLL CALL – 9:00 A.M.

B. INTRODUCTIONS OF BOARD MEMBERS AND AGENCY STAFF

Chairman Stewart called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. The Board and staff introduced themselves.

C. WELCOME TO YUMA

1. Yuma Crossing Exhibits Master Plan Presentation

Mr. Michael Freisinger, Museum Coordinator, presented a PowerPoint Presentation on the Yuma Crossing Exhibits Master Plan. He referred to a slide relating to the Proposed Yuma Crossing State Historic Park Exhibit Design Plan. There is a \$50,000 50/50 match with the City of Yuma/Yuma Crossing National Heritage Area (Arizona State Parks will contribute \$25,000 and the City and National Heritage Area would match that amount). Arizona State Parks' (ASP) funds are coming from the Development Section and are mostly from the Heritage Fund. Staff hope to complete the first phase by Spring of 2006. The City of Yuma is subcontracting to an exhibit company (Hadley Exhibits) out of Buffalo, New York. They are a very reputable exhibits company that worked on projects with the Smithsonian Institute and other museums.

Chairman Stewart asked if this first part is the design or the actual completion of the exhibits.

Mr. Freisinger responded that it is actually just the design conceptual plan. The park staff, the Interpretive Education staff, and he have put together a document with interpretive themes and subthemes and have given it to the City and to the exhibits company to show where staff want to go rather than have them dictate what should be done. The exhibits company will then provide prospective drawings and cross sections. From there staff can do drawings and build-outs and then build the exhibits from them.

Mr. Freisinger reported that the second phase would be a similar plan for Yuma Territorial Prison State Historic Park. It would be a similar type of exhibits, primarily for the museum and then the prison cell areas. It will be a little different from the Crossing, but it will be the same concept. ASP has the \$25,000 and would be going for the match with the Heritage group.

Mr. Freisinger reported that following that, the Development Section, Heritage Fund, and other funds have \$250,000 allocated for an exhibit build-out for both parks. There is a possibility of doing another 50/50 match with Yuma National Heritage Area, depending on the federal allocations year-by-year.

Mr. Scalzo noted he was shaking his head about national funding coming in. He stated that he doesn't see any national funding coming in.

Mr. Travous agreed that it would be very difficult. Any money that is not spent right now, perhaps with the exception of that bridge in Alaska that goes nowhere, is being taken away.

Mr. Freisinger reported that there is another potential for matching funds with the Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) at Yuma Crossing State Historic Park. BOR has been a very good partner at the park. They funded a ramada and some interpretive panels at that park. They have expressed a desire to do an exhibit at the park. They have some very preliminary ideas. This is a potential that needs to be developed and followed up on in the future.

Chairman Stewart noted that, with Yuma Crossing, there is a potential, providing it is a transportation or migration theme, to look at T21 funds. At a recent workshop at the Historic Preservation Conference it was indicated that this was the type of thing that they were looking to fund. She does not believe it would work at the Prison, but she believes there is a good possibility with the Crossing. It might be a way to get a little additional funding.

Mr. Freisinger noted that since September 11, 2001 BOR had to close down its public visitation centers that worked with the Crossing. Since there is a history there with BOR at the Crossing, they work with the park. He believes the agency has an MOU with the BOR.

Mr. Freisinger noted that the initial design projects will give staff a comprehensive exhibit plan with appropriate themes that will be followed by construction and completion of new exhibits. New exhibits will be educational, aesthetic, entertaining, and will give the park visitors a valuable experience. From the early stages, the project

has involved a team effort by ASP staff, the Interpretive Education Planner, Curator, and Exhibits Coordinator.

Mr. Freisinger added that the Visitor's Center at the Yuma Territorial Prison was recently redesigned and remodeled. It was opened a few years ago and was converted, rebuilt, and remodeled by ASP staff and presently functions as the park office and gift shop. The new design enhances the overall integrity of the Visitors Center and will be well-organized, aesthetically pleasing for the visitors, and features new tile flooring, paint, new furniture, a rug, historic photographs, exhibit cases, gift shop, and is the visitor contact station entrance. He displayed some before and after photographs.

Mr. Freisinger gave a historical background of the Territorial Prison. The prison was built in 1876 and was closed down in 1909. It includes a history of the prisoners. A museum was established in 1940, run by the City of Yuma. In 1960 the ASP Board took over the museum.

Mr. Freisinger reported that the Yuma Crossing State Historic Park was the Ft. Yuma Quartermaster Depot. It was built and run by the US Army's soldiers from the 1860s to the 1880s. Afterward, with the coming of the railroad, the fort was no longer needed because of the railroad supplying the army.

Mr. Freisinger noted that there are ongoing discussions on the issue of changing the name of Yuma Crossing State Historical Park to Ft. Yuma Quartermaster Depot State Historic Park, which is more relevant. The name change would reflect more specifically to the original historic purpose and give our visitors a greater sense of place.

Mr. Freisinger added that BOR continues to be an important interpretive partner to the park reflecting the history there.

Chairman Stewart noted that the Board members who were at the tour yesterday were very impressed with the concepts that staff developed and all the work that was put into implementation. It was a team project with great results. It is a great improvement and changes the whole feel of the park. If that's an example of what the Board should look forward to, these will be exciting changes.

Chairman Stewart noted that Mr. Freisinger is the agency's Curator and Mr. Larner, whom the Board met yesterday, is the Exhibits Coordinator.

2. Presentation on Yuma Crossing State Park

Mr. Gerry Emert, Park Manager, reported that Yuma Crossing State Historic Park is the grounds of the old Yuma Quartermaster's Depot that supplied the US Army from 1864 until 1884. Five of the original buildings are on the grounds. Their main interpretive thrust at this time is the Army supply and defense in the Southwest. They cover a very large timeframe in that period of time from about 1776 to about 1920, with a very narrow focus on the military in the actual Quartermaster's Depot period of time from 1864 to 1884. Staff also perform a considerable amount of outreach programming for the BOR. After the September 11 event a lot of federal buildings that had public access were closed to the public. The first part of that process that the park partnered with the BOR was to host their 100th Anniversary celebration in 2002. They were kind enough to donate (on a long-term loan basis) 305 historic photographs of the development of

Yuma from about 1860 to 1945, specifically on the irrigation projects. That has been a key of their current interpretive program. When a mass of photographs are displayed, a lot of comment from the general public is drawn. The grounds were the BOR's 1902 headquarters when President Theodore Roosevelt transferred a portion of the Army Quartermaster's Depot to the Reclamation Service, thus beginning the Reclamation Service and its history in Yuma.

Mr. Emert reported there are three historic components in that first irrigation project on the grounds: the Colorado Siphon, the Yuma main canal, and the historic Second Avenue bridge. The park also assists the BOR and is in the process of developing an interpretive road program for their other historic sites that are offline and are located in California (Siphon Drop Power Plant and Laguna Dam).

Mr. Emert stated that there have been discussions on the name change. Staff thought that changing the name to Yuma Quartermaster's Depot, which is what it really was at one time, will narrow the park's focus point. The Crossing is a very hard name to interpret. It's a very large area. The people actually crossed the River and it also fits within the new interpretive theme (the Colorado River) with two subthemes (military and BOR)

Chairman Stewart asked Mr. Emert to discuss park visitation, busy season, and the typical visitor. She asked whether there are any plans in the new interpretive plan for changing exhibits.

Mr. Emert reported that visitation is probably around 30,000 per year. Their typical heavy visitation season is commencing right now and lasts until about the end of April. The majority of their visitation is Snowbirds. Visitation dramatically falls off during the summer, although they do a lot of school programs throughout the year. During their peak visitation period they probably do four or five school programs per week. He believes they do 1000-1600 just on normal school projects. Two weeks ago they hosted a water festival with 500 students at the park that day. The demographics on visitation is probably retired, with interests in the military or the Colorado River. It has a mythic proportion to the rest of the US and even to the foreign visitors. They have a vision of the Colorado River as a wild river roaring down through the Grand Canyon. When they get to Yuma they are somewhat disappointed. Once the importance of the irrigation project, the dams on the River, and the positive uses of the dams are explained to them, they understand why it is smaller than what they had imagined.

Mr. Emert stated that the plan Mr. Freisinger alluded to has a lot of flexibility for changing exhibits. He believes that is an important part of any historic park or museum. Once one has seen what they have there, there isn't a great need to come back repeatedly. He believes there is flexibility in that plan where those exhibits can be taken off exhibit and replaced.

Mr. Porter noted that he is also on the Board of the Arizona Historical Society (AHS). He has been talking for quite a while about the importance of a close coordination relationship between AHS and ASP in relation to historic parks. The AHS' job is to be in that vanguard of protection, curation, display, and education of matters relating to Arizona's history. Mr. Ream toured the AHS' "dungeons" in Tucson and saw the artifacts they have down there. Mr. Ream actually came out of that tour with a "hit list"

he would like to see on display at state parks. He believes that it is important that there be coordination at all levels with the AHS because they have things that probably should be on display at some of the state parks. He urged staff to keep that in mind. This issue was discussed several years ago, and he has seen some artifacts showing up in some of the parks that, perhaps, should have been there all along. There appears to be more sensitivity in that type of coordination.

Mr. Porter stated that he understood that the parks have a very good working relationship in Yuma with the AHS museum. He asked if that is accurate.

Mr. Emert responded affirmatively. He stated that park staff work with Ms. Megan Reid and her staff at the Sanguinetti House. They have partnered on several occasions. Last week the park hosted a reunion of the families of the steamboat operators. AHS played a major part. They partner on a lot of things. AHS' staff in Tempe have helped the park out quite a bit as well. The park has several artifacts that are on loan from the AHS (the Model T, various pieces of furniture).

Mr. Porter noted that one of the reasons this is on the Agenda is because this is probably the one place in the state where there is a high level of cooperation and coordination between the agencies.

Mr. Emert responded that Yuma is an interesting town. There is enough interpretation of the raw history of the city that allows for three or four historical entities within the area to work together exceptionally well. They can carve out their own niches and not step on anyone else's toes, but they can dovetail together exceptionally well. When the Yuma Crossing National Heritage Area Master Plan begins to evolve and gets up and running, the ground work has been laid where people can go from one place to another and not hear the same story.

Mr. Porter noted that, in theory, everyone who comes to one of the parks should be given a gentle nudge to where the rest of the story is. Conversely, when they visit the AHS museum they would, then, be given a strong nudge towards the parks.

Mr. Emert responded that work is being done in that regard in a couple of different levels. One is that, in the normal course of operations, park staff tell visitors that if they want to know more about the history of the Yuma area, they can go to see the Prison or the Sanguinetti House. On a different level, staff are working with the Yuma Crossing National Heritage Area on a passport. It would be a device that visitors could purchase for \$10 that will get them into the Crossing, the Prison, the Sanguinetti House, the Reservation, and the Arts Center. It will encourage those visitors to see some of those places that they may not have thought about.

Mr. Porter stated that was exactly what he had hoped, and expected, to hear.

Chairman Stewart asked if there are any regular tours of the park open to the general public.

Mr. Emert responded that tours generally start in December when the visitation

population goes up. They schedule tours for twice on Saturdays and Sundays (one in the morning and one in the afternoon).

Chairman Stewart noted that Yuma Crossing will be one of the hosts for the Anza Conference in February.

Mr. Emert responded that it is. The Anza Conference will come to Yuma in February 2006 and the Crossing is one of the host sites, along with the Quesson and the City and the Heritage Area.

Chairman Stewart noted that, according to the Anza website, the Conference will be at the park on February 16 with a tour of the park at 4:00 p.m. and a dinner that evening.

Mr. Porter noted that, if the Board adopts the proposed schedule, the Board will meet February 16th in Lake Havasu. It's not that far away and would be easy for Board members to come to Yuma for that event.

3. Presentation on Yuma Territorial Prison State Park

Mr. Jesse Torres, Park Manager, Yuma Territorial Prison State Park, welcomed the Board to Yuma. He reported that the Yuma Territorial Prison State Historic Park sits on 9 acres overlooking a bluff over Old Town Yuma. They have an operating budget of \$29,500. They have 5 full-time staff members, 1 seasonal, and a couple of volunteers. Their busy season starts in November and runs through March. Most of their visitation is Snowbirds. They have several special events throughout the year in an attempt to draw in the Yuma folk. Their visitation is, however, mainly winter visitors. During the summer the majority of their visitors are foreign. They have visitors from Japan, Germany, Australia, and France. They come during the summer and it gets very quiet at the Territorial Prison. This year, their efforts have been the remodeling the Visitors Center. The park staff did quite a bit of work on the painting; his assistant, Gale Hall, built a wall there; they laid a concrete slab outside for the vending machine. He noted that he was skeptical about the remodeling of the Visitors Center. He did not like the ideas at first. After seeing the completed project, he believes it's a wonderful job. He stated that he had to grudgingly thank John Lerner. It really does look nice and the park staff appreciate it.

Mr. Torres stated that staff's efforts will now be in the re-doing of their timeline. That was a project they had planned for this summer. There are sections of it that needs to be repaired. Their facade needs to go up prior to January when they have the gathering of the gunfighters. In February, Cub Scouts Pack 55 will host a Blue and Gold banquet at the Prison. Other projects include regular maintenance of the park's grounds. They hope to do more interpretive exhibits. One exhibit they are looking at is Lawman of the Territorial Era. They hope to have a display on various convicts, especially some of the more interesting one – crimes that people don't really hear about. They have quite a number of convicts who committed very interesting crimes. That will be more of a rotating display.

Chairman Stewart asked if staff conduct any regular tours.

Mr. Torres responded affirmatively. He stated they have bus groups that come in and

they set up guided tours for them. Regular tours are conducted by their volunteer. They will have tours on Tuesdays, Thursdays, Fridays, Saturdays and Sundays at 11:00, 12:30, and 2:30 p.m. They are open to anyone who walks in.

Mr. Porter asked what kind of relationship the park has with AHS.

Mr. Torres responded that he felt they had a very good relationship. The park staff always tell people to visit the Sanguinetti House Museum.

Chairman Stewart thanked Mr. Torres and his staff for hosting the Board for the tour yesterday. She understands his initial apprehension because when she first heard about the new design she wondered how it would turn out. It turned out wonderful.

Mr. Torres agreed and stated that staff really like it.

Chairman Stewart added that she realized that they came up with the ideas but the park staff were left to execute a lot of it. The Board appreciates the work they put into it as well.

Mr. Porter suggested that the Board move forward to Agenda Item F.1., which is a discussion of collaboration with the AHS. Ms. Megan Reid, Director, Rio Colorado Division of AHS, is in the audience. This issue will dovetail nicely on what the Board has just heard.

Chairman Stewart then moved to Agenda Item F.

F. DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. Discussion on Collaboration with Arizona Historical Society

Mr. Porter introduced Ms. Megan Reid. He stated that he became acquainted with Ms. Reid when he became a member of the AHS Board in 1980. He asked that she discuss her relationship with ASP.

Ms. Megan Reid, AHS, stated that she feels they have always worked well with ASP. For years and years people have talked about whether the agencies should work together in ways that, in Yuma, they already did. They couldn't understand why everyone is making a big fuss about it until they got out of their own little community and found out that people don't work together as well as they do in Yuma.

Ms. Reid stated that they probably have the smallest historic facility. Therefore, they can't do a lot of large events. It has always been a situation where when they have a large event that they want to do they team up with either of the two parks. She feels they have a very good working relationship because each knows what's in the other's collections and who to go to when they can't answer a question someone is asking them. They have become familiar with each other's artifacts and archival collections as well as the facilities and what they can do with each other. She believes they have also been working together more. Their big event was Yuma Crossing Day – which they did together. It is an event where each entity has a special event to celebrate Yuma's history. There have been times when the entities have shared the history re-enactors, the cost of putting the project together, they've shared grants, they've worked with both sites on Anza trail markers, and they've worked with both sides on Colorado River projects. There's a variety of things, including when they have an item that's too big to

store at their facility they usually call Mr. Emert and ask whether he has room for it. He has their steamboat wheel. She feels they have always worked well and communicated well together. She is always glad to say that the people in Yuma don't understand why other people don't.

Mr. Porter asked if she has done a good, exhaustive review of the things the Society has elsewhere, primarily in Tucson, to see if there are still items there that conceivably ought to be in Yuma.

Ms. Reid responded that she probably has not. When they have exhibits that they know they needed something they don't have is when they start looking. They might have a particular item in mind that they want. In the past there has been some trading or long-term loans made of objects between the Prison and their facility that they want on exhibit. It's like if they borrowed something from their facility in Tucson, they might borrow it from here. They probably haven't gone out to the other parks and looked at what is out there unless someone has mentioned something to them.

Mr. Porter responded that that is what he expected to hear. He is aware that, from AHS' side of the house, they have not really started until now to really go and look at what they really have that maybe shouldn't be gathering dust in the bottom of the storage areas and maybe ought to be out at one of the state parks or even in one of their own ancillary museum system. He pointed out that point 2:4D in the Vision and Design is to endorse a programmatic agreement with the Historical Society by February 2006. He had discussions with Dr. Anne Woosley, the Director for the AHS, last Saturday in Tucson and again last Tuesday on this topic. He is assured categorically by Dr. Woosley and by Ms. Norma Colter, the President of AHS, that they are quite anxious and interested to get involved in this process. He believes that the Board is looking at getting that agreement moving. It is something that would give a concerted effort to determine what ASP can do for AHS and what AHS can do for ASP. He suspects that, initially, it may well be a situation of what they can do for ASP. He believes that they have things that should be displayed at some of the parks. He encouraged staff to keep this deadline. He would like to see some kind of agreement come back to the Board with some coordination included that would get that process going. He doesn't want to let it die on the vine. He would like some system in place that encourages that movement by the deadline.

Mr. Travous responded that he is trying to meet all of the deadlines in the Vision and Design. The reason staff put it together was to keep their feet to the fire.

Chairman Stewart asked if Ms. Reid has any suggestions on how the cooperation and sharing that exists in Yuma might be expanded on a statewide level.

Ms. Reid responded that it may be as simple as everyone recognizing who is near each other. They have the advantage of being in one community. Some of the parks are scattered farther afield. Perhaps people just don't think about where they are and the fact that they are close enough to Tucson or to one of their facilities. There may just be a need to get some working relationships going. They also work, along with Mr. Emert and Mr. Torres, with California State Parks, who sometimes feel that they are closer to us than to El Centro. It's just a matter of getting to know who's out there and developing a working relationship between curators or grantors. Sometimes it's even

just getting the volunteers together and taking them to the different places and providing them behind-the-scenes tours. It may not be as impressive at their site, for example, as it might be in Tucson because their collection is not as large. That would certainly be one way to get people to realize what's out there.

Chairman Stewart noted that not all of the parks are as fortunate as the Yuma parks to be in the same community as AHS. Most of the other parks are in more remote areas. She asked if Ms. Reid would be willing to work with one of the parks outside of Yuma.

Ms. Reid responded affirmatively. She noted that they also have a staff person whose job is to go out and help smaller museums.

Mr. Porter added that all AHS facilities have people who are specifically geared to go out and help other local historical sites and museums statewide. That is something for staff to keep in mind. The agency could tap into some of that educational process that they have available. He doesn't see any reason why our parks could not be included in that blanket. He noted that there is an educational need going back within the parks to get the park managers and exhibits staff sensitized to the fact that the AHS exists and that they can be a resource and where the closest local AHS facility would be. Perhaps, the two organizations could even sponsor some kind of joint workshop that might begin that educational process and get the conversation going.

Mr. Porter noted that in the 1980s the relationship between the Society and the 100s of local groups around the state was almost non-existent. They got that ball rolling by sponsoring a Pioneer Retreat for four years that looked at the State of Arizona, selected a central location, and brought in people from all these societies statewide for a day-long seminar on various topics. It was tremendously successful. That started the relationship that was built and very soon AHS was adding staff to go out and provide that service. He believes that perhaps for starters, some sort of session like that between ASP and AHS might be a good thing.

Chairman Stewart added that, along those lines, it would be helpful for the park managers to have the opportunity that the Board members had along with Executive Staff a few years ago of touring the vaults at Tucson. With her involvement with AHS, she went on a fascinating tour of the facility in Tempe a few years ago. She hasn't been to the Yuma Historical Society. A behind-the-scenes tour, seeing how things are done, and seeing artifacts that are not on display is sometimes more interesting than what is being displayed.

Mr. Porter stated that the AHS would be delighted to host those kinds of tours for any of the Parks staff.

Chairman Stewart noted that, as part of the History Convention in Tempe, there was a very good field trip out to the Tempe Historical Society with a behind-the-scenes tour of one of the exhibits and the thinking that went behind how it was set up. More of those kinds of things might be helpful. She has noticed that in Central Arizona there is the Central Arizona Museum Association where they have joint advertising. She wasn't sure whether the agency could tap into something like that.

Ms. Reid noted that there is the Museum Association of Arizona, which is a good contact point. Sometimes there is a lot to be gained by going to their workshops. They

try to offer workshops and conventions around the state that are geared towards mid-level types of learning experiences. She goes on and off that board as a Regional Representative. Someone from ASP usually takes the other two years because they don't have very many people in the Western Region who have the ability to travel to their meetings. That is a very good organization for help in getting to know other organizations and other contacts in the state. She has probably met as many ASP people through that organization as she has regular museum people. That says to her that ASP employees who are working in the museum field are getting more involved in those things, too. It is very good to keep that kind of working relationship going. Mr. Emert is on their Board as a representative for the next two years.

Chairman Stewart noted that perhaps ASP can expand its participation statewide. When the advertising comes out, ASP is not listed. She doesn't know if that's because ASP is not certified as a museum or if that's required. It would seem that it would be helpful. There is usually a Museum Month and there are free tickets – generally during the summer when visitation is low anyway. It is a way of introducing a lot of Arizona residents to the fact that we have a lot of wonderful museums in the state.

Mr. Porter suggested that the Executive Director bring up some of these things with Dr. Woosley that perhaps ASP could piggyback into.

Mr. Travous responded that wonders if there isn't a lot more that goes on than we're talking about here. He knows that ASP staff are involved with education associations, Western Interpreters Association, there's a tourism alliance they are involved in, they are involved with Chambers of Commerce, they go through certification classes for museums. He wouldn't be surprised if there others that he's not aware of. He would also not be surprised if staff are not already participating in some that he's not aware of.

Chairman Stewart stated that she believes the Board is saying that they know a lot of this goes on, but as an agency perhaps it needs to be more formal and encourage it to be done statewide rather than leaving it up to the individual managers to find their way. Some of the staff seem to be more tapped in than others. Perhaps it should be part of the agency's policies or training to encourage it and help facilitate it.

Mr. Porter noted that only 12-15 of the park managers would fit into this area of activity. He believes we are on the right track. It will be interesting to see what staff come back with.

Mr. Travous noted that a group of staff who run the agency's museums have organized. He will bring the notes of this meeting to them to see what they need to do. They are encouraged to get involved; they are given the freedom to get involved. Executive Staff do not dictate so much as give them the freedom to do it on their own. He will ensure they get the Minutes of this meeting and have it as a topic of discussion when they get together.

Chairman Stewart noted that Mr. Freisinger is a member of that group as well. She noticed that the last couple of years the agency has hired new managers at some of the historic parks and some of them don't come from museum backgrounds. It is important to have this as part of the culture in the agency and have staff who will mentor and let them know these things exist. There are people like Mr. Emert who has

been a manager for a long time and has been tapped into a lot of different museum activities throughout the state. As new staff are brought in who might not have that background, it will be more critical that something is in place to formally encourage that.

Mr. Travous responded that is another reason these people were organized to meet. They come together and talk about their common interests and their relationships in curation and things of that nature.

Ms. Reid stated that, as Mr. Porter mentioned, Dr. Woosley is very open to working relationships. It may just take some planning to find that we can work together statewide and not just in Yuma.

Chairman Stewart thanked Ms. Reid for coming to the Board meeting. The Board appreciates her taking the time to meet. The Board also appreciates all the cooperation that she has provided to the two parks in town.

Mr. Travous noted that Mr. Charles Flynn is also present at this meeting. He requested that the Board move to Agenda Item F.3.

Chairman Stewart noted that Ms. Griffith, SHPO, has also arrived and will be discussing SHPO's activities with the National Heritage Area applications and the possibility of looking into a State Heritage Area Program. The Board should probably take both of those Agenda items together.

3. Update on City of Yuma's National Heritage Areas

Mr. Charles Flynn addressed the Board. Mr. Flynn thanked the Board. He stated that over the past two to three years the staff, with the Board's support, were able to resolve a very difficult land issue within their redevelopment area. That has been completed. Without the Board's efforts, it would not have happened. He wanted to share what that means to the Board today.

Mr. Flynn referred to a slide of the entire redevelopment plan. As of last November it became an adopted Development Agreement. He wanted to discuss how this will positively impact what is happening. The effort to amass the land for redevelopment occurred. The major piece was at North Madison where the hotel and conference center will be. That is where the 2 acres of land was so involved. In terms of cooperation, they had a workshop where everyone was brought together. It is a National Historic Landmark, it was federal land passed through the state to the City for redevelopment. They were able to come together and agree on historic design guidelines that the City agreed to adopt and overlay this entire site so there will be local control and no inappropriate development on private or City land, as well as the former federal land. Additionally, the developer saw the tremendous value of respecting the site – not only the Yuma Crossing State Historic Park, but the entire landmark, as development moves forward. Moving south, at the old boat control site, there will be 60-80 condominium units built overlooking the canal and the park. There will be a tremendous amount of activity. They are bringing the city to the park. Further to the west, there will be a small restaurant and hotel pad. The old City Hall will remain as an important historic asset. Further to the east, the old National Guard site will be reserved for a new federal Courthouse (50,000 sf). Further to the east, retail and offices will connect the riverfront

to the downtown, as well a parking deck which will hopefully screen the water treatment plant.

Mr. Flynn stated that it is important to understand how it all fits together as the Yuma Crossing State Park evolves. Mr. Emert discussed the interpretive plan for the entire area. They are working very closely with all of their partners. They very much support the idea of the name change. As this commercial development occurs and as they try to improve the historic interpretation of the entire area, we need to think of Yuma Crossing as the entire area. People, frankly, are confused. They go to Yuma Crossing State Park and think that's where the crossing is. That's only a part of the story. It diminishes what the agency is trying to do at that park and confuses people overall. He believes that by giving the sense that the Yuma Crossing is this entire experience, and that what can be learned at the state park relates to supply and defense, the story of water in the desert, does strengthen the facility and will strengthen the whole visitor experience throughout. They are very supportive of the name change.

Mr. Flynn discussed the issue of federal funding. It has been a great frustration to him. They work very closely with all of their partners, especially ASP. Given their extremely difficult budget environments, they are willing to make commitments. The Heritage Area is able to receive up to \$1 million per year for a total of \$10 million over a 15-year period. They hoped to get between \$600,000-\$800,000 per year. They have averaged \$230,000 per year. It has been extremely frustrating because their commitment to the Board was genuine. They believed they would be receiving higher levels of funding and have not. They had to focus on East Weapons and Gateway Park. He stated that he will recommend to his board that as they get past next Fiscal Year and get into 2007 and 2008, because the Board is willing to make that 50/50 commitment, as funds become available they do so as well. He believes that the park will become an integral part of the Yuma community. He envisions 10 years from now that 90% of the visitation to the park will come across the bridge and into the park because there will have a tremendous amount of activity going on (tourism and residents wanting to access the green space of the park and public events). Their idea allows for that sort of discussion to move forward.

Mr. Flynn stated that the Heritage Area feels very strongly about updating the museum at the Territorial Prison. That park is the flagship. When people come to Yuma, that's their first point of contact with Yuma. They believe it's a great story and deserves a lot of interpretation by use of 21st century technology. They have an innovative way to do this. They have a design team that can be brought to bear to work with park staff and get things done quickly. With the agreements that are in place, they can move some of these projects much more quickly than the state can through their procurement process.

If they can find ways to think outside the box and make things happen faster, they want to do that.

Mr. Flynn stated that everyone needs to be thinking about 2009. The agreement for continued funding for Yuma Crossing State Park ends at that time because the City has a 2% hotel/entertainment/food tax that will terminate at that time. It is critical that we work together and get some of these projects moving forward and show the community

(in 2007 or 2008) that they have active partners at the federal and state level who are helping leverage these local dollars to make improvements to the community to improve tourism and that they can go together, united, saying if that tax is renewed in some form that there will be tremendous benefits to the entire community and that these partnerships will strengthen it. Over the next two years or so there will be discussions on how to bring that forward locally.

Mr. Porter asked how much of their budget comes from that tax.

Mr. Flynn responded that the Yuma Crossing National Heritage Area receives none of it. The City made a commitment for 10 years to fund the Yuma Crossing National Heritage Area operations and staff at a budget of about \$500,000 to match federal funding just to implement the plan for Yuma Crossing National Heritage Area. That is good. However, the 2% funding is critical to the operation of Yuma Crossing State Park.

Chairman Stewart noted that one of the things that was discussed when Mr. Flynn came to the Board's meeting in Sedona was her concern that landscaping along the fenceline was included in the plan so that visitors didn't look out on cars, trash cans, etc. She asked if that is part of this plan.

Mr. Flynn responded affirmatively. The Yuma Crossing Historic Design Guidelines have been adopted by the City. Prior to the development on the hotel being reviewed locally, it will be provided to the State Historic Preservation Office for comment, back to the local CLG, who will then take those comments and develop a regulatory review of the development. The key thing in the design guidelines is that the development must be in context and address the issue of the context. The Yuma Crossing State Park and the facilities that are there – the adobes and houses, etc. – must really predominate and dictate the design moving forward. Fortunately, with the way the topography is they can build a three-story hotel that could work. There will be a process in place and they will be happy to engage not just SHPO, but ASP staff as well for that review. It is a very rigorous review locally. He is pleased that the City made that commitment. He noted that 10-15 years ago they were talking about all sorts of development on that site that would have been entirely inappropriate. Fortunately that is all past and there now is this regulatory design in the National Historic Landmark north of First Street that should protect everyone's interests.

Mr. Flynn discussed the Passport. The Heritage Area is funding this program in terms of coordinating design and printing and then coordinating with ASP and the Center and Visitor's Bureau for the sale and distribution of the funds. ASP staff have been great in helping make it happen. This is one of the pieces going forward that will help tremendously in helping to coordinate and create a synergy among all the sites.

Chairman Stewart noted that the funding for the park ends in 2009. She asked if there will be another bond measure or if the City is trying to come up with ways to make up that funding.

Mr. Flynn responded that he could not speak for the City Council or the Administration. He thinks the intent is that we need to be sensitive to the hotel and restaurant community and, given the various taxes, think about how it affects them. He

believes the goal is to create a stable source of funds that will support tourism, promotion, development, the parks in the community, the riverfront project, and, in particular, this area. All one has to do is look at that picture and see the Yuma Crossing State Park is an important historic and recreational asset for the entire Riverfront Project and we want to make sure it continues.

Mr. Porter noted that the federal funding has not been safe. Assuming a worst case scenario that, in fact, the federal funding continues to be at least as low as it has been and maybe goes lower he asked what that will do to the program.

Mr. Flynn responded that the good news is that Senator Kyle and Congressmen Pastore and Grijalva have been supportive. A year ago Senator Kyle came out and toured the Heritage Area. He was very impressed and very supportive. He is going to bat for the project. Mr. Flynn believes they will be at the \$350,000-\$400,000 range. He feels secure with that. He wouldn't count on more than that. If, two years from now, they try to do one of these major projects, they will need to eventually commit almost all of the federal funding to match the state funding. He is willing to do that. The East Wetlands project, which they had committed a good deal of money to, is rolling. They now have multiple environmental funding. They don't really have to use Heritage money any more for that. Their current focus is not only on the Gateway Park but also the Pivot Point. One of the issues and controversies in this community five years ago was the dismantling and removal of the settlement tanks. It was a very contentious issue. One of the commitments that the community made was to interpret the railroad history on site. They have committed all of their Heritage funding towards that project in addition to applying for a T21 grant so they can interpret the railroad history. He noted that one issue they discussed was that Yuma Crossing State Park has a locomotive. It's not in context. There were no locomotives there. In actuality, Madison Avenue was where the first railroad came into Arizona. It's a very important site. They want to talk about that. The Heritage Area's first commitment is to ensure that they interpret and preserve that railroad. Subsequent to that, given the design we are working together on these two parts, it makes sense for them to make commitments to the Board, even if it means they are committing all their funding for a particular year. It may be two years from now before that happens. He is encouraged that ASP will continue to commit funds in anticipation of their federal funds.

Chairman Stewart responded that, from her discussions with Mr. Kevin Eatherly, she got the impression that the Heritage Area feel things are looking better in terms of

revenue as a result of discussions with Senator Kyle and that they do not anticipate anything getting any worse.

Mr. Flynn responded affirmatively. He stated that, given the federal budget deficit, he doesn't envision it radically improving; he does believe it will settle at the \$450,000-\$500,000 which would then allow them to make sizable commitments.

Mr. Travous stated that the latest indication staff have is that the budget cuts were going to be on the stateside Land and Water Conservation Fund, then in historic preservation, with large amounts of money being earmarked on the \$6.7 million from

the Heritage Area set-asides. That would be devastating. He believes the foundation of the promise that staff made has been the relationships back and forth. What the City has been able to do with the B&B tax up and down the river is incredible. He stated that he disagrees with Mr. Flynn. If they can maintain the funding they are currently receiving, they will be doing something that no one else will be able to do over the next couple of years. He applauds that effort. At the same time, he believes staff need to concentrate on what can be done together and anything received from the feds would just be gravy.

Mr. Porter stated he would have to echo Mr. Travous' comments in the sense that it is very dangerous to even count on those federal funds. He recalls a presentation several years ago and the enthusiasm and confidence that the Heritage Area would get the \$1 million funding from the feds. He actually believed it. He is just as frustrated as Mr. Flynn and advised that they be careful. It is just not a stable source of funding.

Mr. Flynn responded that they have fought very hard to work their way up from \$200,000 to \$350,000. It's like trench warfare. He believes that the strategy will be to go in for \$800,000-\$900,000; if it gets cut in half, at least we're there. There are people fighting for us.

Chairman Stewart thanked Mr. Flynn. She noted the Board's appreciation of his spending time with them last night and taking the time to come to this meeting today.

Mr. Porter noted that they have indicated that they may not get that continued funding in the partnership. They suggested that would be disastrous for us. He recognizes that any time we don't have money coming in it is painful. He asked if staff are already looking at that and working on how to deal with it.

Mr. Travous responded that staff don't wait until 2009 to start working on it; we'll start in 2007. We'll try to get it re-introduced and re-done so in case it fails there is time to try again. Staff will be working with them on it.

Mr. Porter noted that if there's a potential problem down the road staff need to start looking hard at it now.

Mr. Flynn stated that he didn't mean it to be a problem. It is on the horizon; they recognize it; they will deal with it.

2. SHPO Report on State Heritage Area Programs and National Area Programs

Ms. Carol Griffith, Deputy Director, SHPO, presented an update on what is happening within the National Heritage Area at the moment in the state. Ms. Griffith reported that the Santa Cruz Heritage Area includes a number of state parks. It will go to Congress for approval this year. It still has three years in development of the planning. National Heritage Areas are geographic areas that are tied together by historical themes. It includes natural areas, landscapes, historical properties, and the culture of the area. It is really a large area for planning and economic development of the different sorts of sites and activities in the area. It has a lot of potential for economic development.

Ms. Griffith stated that, in addition to the Santa Cruz Heritage Area, the Center for Desert Archaeology (a private non-profit organization) has been working to put together the rigorous work that needs to be done to go to Congress. They are working

in the Little Colorado River drainage on a Little Colorado River Heritage Area. That is still in development. They are still having public meetings and putting things together.

Chairman Stewart noted that the Little Colorado River Heritage Area includes at least one of the state parks.

Ms. Griffith noted that it includes Lyman Lake, Homolovi, and Fool Hollow. There are four parks in the Santa Cruz National Heritage Area.

Mr. Griffith reported that the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) conferences have included sessions on Heritage Areas over the past few years. There has been discussion on state Heritage Areas. A lot of the eastern states have State Heritage Areas that function in the same way as National Heritage Areas, except that they don't have Congressional approval. They still have the benefits of the organization, planning, and economic development regions. There has been discussion about putting together some legislation to create State Heritage Areas. The groups who have been working on this issue have decided not to move on this issue this year because they want to focus on promoting the Santa Cruz and get it listed as a National Heritage Area. They do want to pursue the possibility of legislation next year.

Chairman Stewart asked if there is one in Utah.

Ms. Griffith responded that Utah, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York, and Tennessee all have State Heritage Areas as well as National Heritage Areas.

Chairman Stewart asked if they have found it to be helpful in terms of attracting grant money.

Ms. Griffith responded affirmatively. She added that even if there isn't any state funding going to the heritage areas they do, because they are large areas with many partners – they're run at a grassroots level, have an advantage for getting larger grants because of that public buy-in and public benefits. The cooperative planning, commercial, and tourism help as well. Utah has quite a bit in the way of promotion and a lot of national publicity for these areas for tourism.

Chairman Stewart noted that after the session two years ago on the heritage areas and the meeting with Ms. Brenda Barrett she went to Utah and Idaho and drove through one of these areas. She picked up one of their brochures. It really added a lot to the return trip. She used it on the return trip and stopped at a lot of places she wouldn't otherwise have stopped because it put them into the historical and cultural context of the region. It appeared to her that it would be a way to promote our parks and get people to come to Arizona or Arizonans to visit other parts of the state.

Mr. Porter asked how the Santa Cruz Valley National Heritage Area would dovetail in with the Board's stated goal of acting as an enabler rather than getting into the business of trying to conserve that watershed, per se, but recognize the importance that all of the groups who have an interest in that area come together to accomplish that. It strikes him that this sort of dovetails right in with that concept.

Mr. Travous responded that it is a process of those local people doing it themselves and not really relying on an agency. What is happening in that area is just a confederacy of

people with varying interests finding common ground and doing it on their own and finding that they can get grants. He might be able to give the Board some state legislation to help describe what can be in it. That would be helpful. However, it appears to him to be a locally-driven type of project. That is probably where it will get its strength. All too often, what happens is something like this gets going, and it's given to a "mother" agency. It's like a congregation where once they have a preacher they don't have to go out and proselytize. It appears that this is the same kind of thing. It's strength will be on its local people.

Chairman Stewart responded that she believes its strength comes from local people setting it up and having the momentum. However, having the state program gives it the stamp of approval and is something they can then leverage. It helps them get the tourism and economic development dollars. She believes it is important to have a state coordinating person to facilitate it.

Mr. Travous responded that there can't be a state heritage area without there being something to guide it along.

Chairman Stewart stated that the impression she got from the meeting she attended was that in Utah it hasn't really bogged things down but has helped facilitate.

Ms. Griffith reported that Mr. Travous is exactly right. The heritage areas are really locally-driven and locally-managed. Where the states have been able to help is with grant funding, technical assistance, and some states do sort of a technical committee for the state heritage areas. It varies from state to state. They give advice and assist with any technical issues that the local people and entities who are putting it together might have. Their strength really is that they are grassroots and are managed locally. The Santa Cruz does have a management board that is in place to manage the heritage area. Of course, it is a partnership with state, federal, and local governments in the sense that there is funding and cooperation with state and federal parks.

Chairman Stewart stated that she believed it fits in with the Board's Vision. If there were a State Heritage Area program, the criteria for the grants could be revamped to award extra points for those applicants who are part of a heritage area program. She believes that one of the keys to the heritage area programs, whether they be state or federal, is that there is regional planning. It's more than just one little entity doing their thing in a vacuum. Part of the Board's focus has been planning, but on a smaller basis. Having the state program then gives a basis to support them with grant funds.

Mr. Porter asked if there is a chance of getting Hopi involved in the Little Colorado Heritage plan.

Ms. Griffith responded that the Center for Desert Archaeology has been conducting all of those meetings. Hopi have been coming to the meetings. She's not sure what their involvement might be. They are conducting public meetings in the area. This was an outgrowth of a meeting that was held in Snowflake about three years ago. They were concerned about preserving some of their Petroco Canyons and looking for ways to do that. Out of that meeting the people from Springerville and Snowflake became involved in wanting to pursue more information. The Center for Desert Archaeology has taken the lead to organize the different public meetings throughout the area. Hopi

has been involved in that.

Chairman Stewart asked if there was discussion with people in the Florence and Casa Grande area.

Ms. Griffith responded that there was some discussion in Coolidge about four years ago about having a heritage area there that would run along the river. Staff have not heard anything about that recently. She spoke with someone in Florence this week and they were not aware of anything going on at the moment. She doesn't know what has happened with that. People who were initially moving it along have backed off.

Chairman Stewart thanked Ms. Griffith for coming to the meeting. She feels it is important that Ms. Griffith has helped facilitate this by having the sessions at the conference and giving people the opportunity to explore these ideas. It is helpful for the Board to know that there is a possibility of doing that. While the timing may not be right this year, it is something that should certainly be kept on the back burner to perhaps move to the front burner next year.

Chairman Stewart called for a Recess at 10:42 a.m.

Chairman Stewart reconvened the meeting at 11:00 a.m.

D. CONSENT AGENDA - The following items of a noncontroversial nature have been grouped together for a single vote without Board discussion. The Consent Agenda is a timesaving device and Board members received documentation on these items for their review prior to the open meeting. Any Board member may remove any item from the Consent Agenda for discussion and a separate vote at this meeting as deemed necessary. The public may view the documentation relating to the Consent Agenda at the Board's office, 1300 W. Washington, Suite 104, Phoenix, Arizona.

- 1. Approve Minutes of October 20, 2005 Arizona State Parks Board Meeting**
- 2. Approve Executive Session Minutes of October 20, 2005 Arizona State Parks Board Meeting**
- 3. Approve Minutes of November 4, 2005 Arizona State Parks Board Meeting**
- 4. Designation of Park Ranger Law Enforcement Officer** – Staff recommends that the Arizona State Parks board designate Jennifer Parks and Colt Alford as Arizona State Parks Law Enforcement Officers, contingent upon their successfully completing the CARLOTA training.
- 5. Consider Request for a One-Year Extension of the Project End Date for the Town of Snowflake Historic Preservation Fund Project #640212** – Staff recommends approval of a one-year extension to the project end date from November 4, 2005 to November 4, 2006 to allow the Town of Snowflake time to complete project #640212, Snowflake Academy Building. HPAC unanimously approved a one-year extension of the Snowflake Academy Building at their meeting on October 31, 2005.
- 6. Consider Emergency Request from the Casa Grande Art Museum (Gus**

Kratzka House Arizona State Historic Property Inventory No. CG-126) – Staff recommends approval of a waiver of retroactivity to allow the costs incurred to pre-stabilize the building to be applied against the matching fund requirement for the Casa Grande Art Museum Historic Preservation Grant Project in the next application cycle (FY 2005 2nd Grant Cycle). HPAC, at their meeting on October 31, 2005, unanimously approved a waiver of retroactivity to allow costs incurred for eligible scope items completed to programmatic standards to pre-stabilize the Casa Grande Art Museum and that the funds may be applied against the matching funds requirement in the FY 2005 second-cycle grant cycle due to imminent threat to the building pending SHPO approval.

Chairman Stewart stated that before she would entertain a motion on the Consent Agenda she wanted to be sure that everyone had a chance to review the Minutes of the November 4th meeting that was just received.

Mr. Scalzo made a motion to accept the Consent Agenda Items 1-6.

Mr. Porter seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

E. BOARD ACTION ITEMS

- 1. Proposed 2006 Parks Board Meeting Schedule** – Staff recommends that the Board approve the proposed meeting schedule for calendar year 2006.

Chairman Stewart stated she had three questions to raise before adoption to be sure that she understands what it being proposed. The first question was for the meeting to be held on November 17, 2006. She noted that is a Friday.

Mr. Porter responded that that is an error. It should be November 16, 2006.

Chairman Stewart referred to the meeting scheduled for May 18. She asked if that is a one-day or two-day meeting. She noted that Mr. Porter had said he wanted to have a retreat in May. She asked if the retreat would be held on a separate day.

Mr. Porter responded that he thought it would be appropriate to have the retreat during the July meeting at Tonto. That meeting will be conducted as a full two-day meeting. The first day will be the retreat. The July 19 meeting would begin around 10:00 a.m. The meetings will be held at the Lodge at Tonto Natural Bridge State Park.

Chairman Stewart asked, regarding the March and November meetings, if a decision has been made as to which will be in Oracle and which will be in Sonoita Creek.

Mr. Porter responded negatively. The reason is that staff are reasonably sure that the Sonoita Natural Area dedication will occur next year.

Mr. Travous added that the dedication will be the opening of the area to the public. There was a celebration of the purchase of the property a few years ago. This will be the opening to the public.

Mr. Porter added that he wants to give a bit of a fudge factor about when the Sonoita opening will be. Staff are hoping it can be as early as March; in case it isn't, then it will be November. He would like to leave it that way for now. By the January meeting staff

should be able to tie it down.

Mr. Scalzo offered to hold the September 21 meeting which is to be held in the Phoenix area for the grants awards at the County's Desert Outdoor Center at Lake Pleasant Regional Park. They have a large meeting area that will hold at least 150; it's a beautiful setting up against Lake Pleasant; it's relatively convenient off of Route 74 for visitors. AORCC has met in the Peoria area. This is near a large population area and very accessible. He believes people would enjoy it. It's a restful area in a beautiful setting.

Mr. Porter noted that meeting is one that usually has a tendency to go longer than normal, draws an audience, and has a lot of discussion. It makes it hard on the Secretary if we don't have the kind of set-up that she can use. He asked what kind of facility is needed for that purpose.

Ms. Busser responded that for several years that meeting was held at a City park in Phoenix in their Environmental Education Center. That facility worked fine. As long as she can get in early in the morning and there is a Board set-up available, enough seating available, and assistance in setting up the room it would not be a problem. It isn't that far away from the Phoenix Office. She had no problem with the facility. She felt it would be a nice change to hold that meeting at a County park.

Mr. Porter stated that the site sounds wonderful to him.

Chairman Stewart agreed that it is a beautiful setting and there is plenty of parking.

Chairman Stewart suggested the Board members review their calendars and let Mr. Porter know if there are any conflicts. Today, for instance, the Board is thin on its quorum. The more advance notice of any potential problems the better.

Mr. Scalzo stated that he had a problem with the March 16th meeting. He teaches at the National Recreation Parks school. It ends on March 17th. It is scheduled years in advance. He will not be able to attend that meeting. Otherwise they look good, depending on a couple of meetings he can't control that are called by elected officials.

Board Action

Mr. Hays: I move that the Board adopt the proposed schedule for 2006.

Mr. Porter seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

- 2. Appoint New Members to the Historic Preservation Advisory Committee (HPAC)** – Staff recommends that the Board appoint Winston Thorne, Jr. and Joseph Nucci to fill the vacancies for Preservation professionals on HPAC and that they serve a three-year term beginning January 1, 2006.

Board Action

Mr. Porter: I move that the Board appoint Winston Thorne, Jr. and Joseph Nucci to fill the vacancies for Preservation professionals on HPAC and that they serve a three-year term beginning January 1, 2006.

Mr. Scalzo seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

- 3. Appoint New Members to the Off-Highway Vehicle Advisory Group**

(OHVAG) – Staff recommends that the Board appoint James R. Schreiner to fill the Citizen-at-Large vacancy and Richard Hank Rogers to fill the OHV Organization vacancy on OHVAG and that they serve a three-year term beginning January 1, 2006.

Board Action

Mr. Porter: I move that the Board appoint James R. Schreiner to fill the Citizen-at-Large vacancy on OHVAG and that he serve a three-year term beginning January 1, 2006. I further move that Richard Hank Rogers be appointed to fill the OHV Organization vacancy on OHVAG and that he serve a three-year term beginning January 1, 2006.

Mr. Scalzo seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

- 4. Appoint New Members to the Arizona State Committee on Trails** – Staff recommends that the Board appoint Cate Bradley, Bonnie Winslow, Kent Taylor, Reba Grandrud, Tami Emmett, Sonia Overholser, Doug Potts, Vincent Murray, Andrew Fish, Russell Freeman, and Jeri Merritt to fill the vacancies in ASCOT and that they serve a three-year term beginning January 1, 2006.

Board Action

Mr. Scalzo: I move that the Board appoint Cate Bradley, Bonnie Winslow, Kent Taylor, Reba Grandrud, Tami Emmett, Sonia Overholser, Doug Potts, Vincent Murray, Andrew Fish, Russell Freeman, and Jeri Merritt to fill the vacancies in ASCOT and that they serve a three-year term beginning January 1, 2006.

Mr. Porter seconded the motion.

Mr. Scalzo stated that he knows several of these individuals. He is very impressed with all the people who want to serve on these committees.

Chairman Stewart stated that she seconded that comment. She has been to a couple of the ASCOT meetings. It is a real working group with some really capable people serving on it. The Board has seen some of the results of their efforts. The Board is fortunate to have these people volunteer.

The motion carried unanimously.

- 5. Appoint Members to the Natural Areas Program Advisory Committee (NAPAC)** – Staff recommends that the Board reappoint Linda Kennedy and John Hays to fill the vacancies on NAPAC and that they serve a three-year term beginning January 1, 2006.

Board Action

Mr. Porter: I move that the Board reappoint Linda Kennedy and John Hays to fill the vacancies on NAPAC and that they serve a three-year term beginning January 1, 2006.

John U. Hays seconded the motion.

Chairman Stewart stated that she believes both individuals are excellent appointees and have done an excellent job. She also would like to encourage the committee next year to find some representative from the northern part of the state. Ahwatukee is as far north

as any member of that committee goes. One of the Board's primary projects is the Verde Valley. There is no representation on the committee from that part of the state. She believes the Board wants to ask the committee to actively search out people so that there is a little more geographic representation within the state.

The motion carried unanimously.

6. Land Trust Reform – Discussion regarding and possible action regarding support of the State Land Reform package

Chairman Stewart stated that she asked Mr. Travous to place this item on the Agenda because as the Board has received a couple of presentations, there is an Initiative being proposed that affects six of our state parks. It is an important opportunity for the Board to support this effort to get the message out to the public that this actually affects ASP. She has been surprised as she's talked with legislators that even the legislative leadership had no idea that any of our state parks involve state Trust Land. By supporting this Initiative, the Board is better able to educate the public and this will facilitate the Board owning some of the properties they currently lease. In most cases the Board will be required to purchase them, but would not have to compete at an auction and not be able to pay more than the appraised value. She believes it is very important that the Board support this Initiative. Staff are not in a position to push the Initiative. She wanted to make it clear that she was the one who had it placed on the Agenda and she is the one who is requesting that the Board consider a Resolution. She distributed a Resolution for the Board to consider.

Board Action

Mr. Porter: I move the adoption of the proposed Resolution:

WHEREAS, the measure, Conserving Arizona's Future, is a statewide citizen's ballot initiative that will protect some of the most important natural areas in our state from development; and,

WHEREAS, the purpose of the initiative is to permit the state of Arizona to manage state trust land in ways that promote well-planned growth, conservation, and sound stewardship; and

WHEREAS, the initiative measure would protect and preserve for future generations the significant natural, cultural, and historical assets of certain state trust lands by establishing a conservation reserve of approximately 694,000 acres; and

WHEREAS, the initiative establishes a system of conservation reserve lands that consists of 59 special areas; and,

WHEREAS, several Arizona State Parks properties are included within this conservation reserve system: Catalina State Park; Homolovi Ruins State Park; Kartchner Caverns State Park; Lake Havasu State Park; Lyman Lake State Park; Oracle State Park; Patagonia Lake State Park/Sonoita Creek State Natural Area; Picacho Peak State Park; and, Spur Cross Ranch Conservation Area; and

WHEREAS, a broad coalition including educators, conservationists, recreational groups and business leaders support this initiative;

BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED, the Arizona State Parks Board endorses the Conserving Arizona's Future statewide citizens ballot initiative, and further, encourages the citizens of the state to support the initiative by signing petitions to place the measure on the ballot in November 2006

Mr. Scalzo seconded the motion.

Mr. Hays asked if the initiative provides for land exchanges.

Chairman Stewart responded there is no provision for land exchanges. It was felt that since exchanges have been voted down five or six times that it would prevent this initiative from passing. For whatever reasons, the public is suspicious of exchanges even though they do have some merit. They are trying to be practical and come up with something that would be likely to go through.

Mr. Hays stated that he hoped land exchanges would be a reality some day. It is one of the most important tools the Land Commissioner could have.

The motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Stewart stated that she has asked staff to put together a notebook for the Board that updates the materials that the Board received in January that showed each of the parks that were affected by State Trust Land and what the Board is requesting. That has changed because what is in this measure is slightly different from what the Board asked for. Staff will provide new maps and a description as to why it is important to the Board. She believes this information will be helpful as the Board goes out into the community and people ask about this initiative the Board will be able to show them this information. She believes a photograph of each of the parks will be included to entice people. She plans to spend as much time next year as she can letting the public know about this and its importance to ASP. Just about everyone she has talked to except the people who are involved in drafting this initiative were totally unaware that several of the parks rely on State Trust Lands for the park itself and that several other parks rely on the State Trust Land remaining open space for the investment the taxpayers put into the park to be protected. With the wrong kinds of development next to some of these parks no one would want to go there for the reasons they go now.

Mr. Porter stated that they would be pleased to give Ms. Stewart a forum to push it hard at the convention in April.

G. EXECUTIVE STAFF UPDATES

1. Vision and Design Update

Chairman Stewart noted that the Board received Mr. Travous' report (page 84 of the Board packet) letting them know where staff are. The Board also received the revised Draft. She noticed one item left out that the Board requested be left in there. Mr. Porter requested that Objective 2:2.B, Local, Regional, and State Parks Land and Water Conservation Fund and SLIF, the language should read "representative grant

applicants and recipients”.

Mr. Porter noted that he was particularly interested in the very large number of items that have dates for some level of implementation that are short-fused from when they were adopted. For example, some were to be accomplished or at least moved on by this month; others are coming up in January of next year. Comparing the report, it appears that staff are on a pretty good track in trying to meet those deadlines.

Mr. Travous responded that that is true as of this moment; however, staff have a lot of work to do over the next couple of months.

Mr. Porter stated that, in heeding Mr. Cordasco’s cry at the last meeting regarding patience, he is trying to exercise patience. However, he is pleased to see that staff are not going to abuse that patience.

Mr. Travous noted that a calendar was included in the Board packet.

Chairman Stewart responded that it is very helpful to have that document. She is pleased it is in writing. The Board can keep this information in their notebooks and refer back to it. She expressed her opinion on the 3:1.A of the Vision and Design, where the plan was to establish a three-person review team to monitor each goal by the September Board meeting. Mr. Travous indicated that some of the staff gave feedback that they could spend their time on a review team or spend their time meeting the goal. She stated that the Board feels like they will be reviewing this. She doesn’t know that the Board feels there is any need to have the review teams.

Mr. Travous responded that he had originally put that objective in the Vision and Design in order to ensure that there is coordination going on and spread out through the organization. He found out that when people were putting it together, that that internal process was already going on and there was no need for the formality. They were already doing it. They are already meeting to meet the goal.

Mr. Porter agreed that the Board will not throw rocks at staff over that issue.

Chairman Stewart suggested that that goal doesn’t even need to be there.

Mr. Scalzo asked if there would be regular reports to review the progress.

Chairman Stewart responded that staff would still present reports. This was an internal process Mr. Travous was going to have three staff people review the progress being made. She is saying that since the Board has required that there be quarterly reports in writing the Board doesn’t need this internal process in place. She would prefer that, unless staff really want it, that it be removed.

Mr. Travous noted that he uses the calendar in his Executive Staff meetings to see whether everyone is on track. It is also an internal working tool.

Chairman Stewart stated that she would like to ensure there is movement on 2:5.A. There are objectives about employee access to PAMS. She wants to ensure that focus remains on establishing the priority of the components. As was discussed before, if the library doesn’t have any volumes in it, access doesn’t mean a whole lot.

2. Update on Meeting at Lake Havasu

Mr. Porter reported that he, Mr. Travous, and Mr. Ream attended that meeting. He felt it was a very positive meeting. There was a good session with the City Manager and his staff in just about every area of activity dealing with the park itself or any of the planning. Everyone there was in complete agreement that there is a very serious issue. There is a tremendous need to address the facilities there. If we don't do so in the very near future on a massive scale, there will be very serious problems – conceivably even fatalities.

Mr. Porter stated that he was very pleased that Lake Havasu has given a lot of thought to it. He believes that they will practically bend over backwards to work with the Board. Other entities were identified (BOR, Ft. Mohave Tribe) who have an interest in possibly linking with the park with a cross-lake commuter boat process. They are more and more turning to Lake Havasu for medical, shopping, etc. They are looking to bring their people across the lake with a short hop rather than having to drive to Needles, CA or driving to Las Vegas. That is very tentative and very tenuous. It is certainly something the Board will want to take into account because there may very well be funds they could get to help, perhaps, with a parking lot. There are other facilities that could be tapped into.

Chairman Stewart noted that we have a problem with too much traffic on the lake and people not being able to get in and off of the lake. The Board wants to do something about that and they want some of the Board's land.

Mr. Porter responded that there might be some tribal activity, but no one is talking about giving anyone any of the Board's land. What the Board need to look at is that the current areas we are using for the boat launching facilities are not only inadequate, but there's probably no adequate land there to do the things that need to be done. The land is available on Contact Point that is still part of the park but is not currently being utilized for much more than simply a law enforcement launching facility, which is badly in need of attention and updating as well. There have been proposals from the Sheriff of Mohave County that were very well thought out about the kinds of facilities that are needed for joint law enforcement operation there centered in the park. That point in many ways is ideal for the kind of use we might need to make. Mr. Ream has some plans he's been working on for a long time about what he would like to see there. With that kind of background, he asked Mr. Travous and Mr. Ream to fill in some of these gaps and give the Board their twist on how that meeting went and an overview of what the Board may be looking at down the road. It could be some very expensive and very comprehensive changes in that process.

Ms. Hernbrode cautioned the Board that a lot of that detail was not included in this Agenda item. The Board needs to be cautious about having discussion on this issue.

Chairman Stewart stated that when this item was placed on the Agenda at the last Board meeting there was an explanation of what the problem was – that there was a problem with the boat ramps and that there is a dangerous situation. She believes this is an update on the meeting that was scheduled and what was discussed there.

Ms. Hernbrode responded that she understands that that does help. However, if she

were a member of the public who picked up this Agenda item, that does not really give her any idea what the Board is going to be discussing.

Chairman Stewart stated that she believed the Board is probably OK so far.

Mr. Travous updated the Board on the meeting at Lake Havasu and provided the background that staff gave them at that meeting. He believes that a problem well-stated is half-solved. He believes that is where the meeting started. The problem at Lake Havasu is there is a growing number of boats, many of them choking into the area around the bridge and channel; there is an exhausted number of boat ramps that get people on and off and becomes a choking point; there are relatively few pieces of land left to solve the problem. There is plenty of capacity on the lake; there are few places one can look to that will solve the problem of the choking of people that interplay between the people on and off the water.

Mr. Travous stated that, traditionally, the solution has been more boat ramps. And that is certainly still needed. In his discussions with Mr. Ream at this meeting, it is beyond that in that there needs to be another point of interest on the lake. The place to go on the lake is still the channel. If more access to the lake can be created while also making it an attraction in and of itself, all of the people won't be trying to go to the same part of the lake.

Mr. Travous reported that staff have committed and the City has committed back to put staffs' heads together. The more he talks and listens to Mr. Ream the more he is convinced he is absolutely right. Staff need to look at this on a grand scale. There will be another meeting with the City prior to the Board meeting in February to come up with some design ideas and some approaches to solving this problem that will be presented to the Board in February in a graphic scale to give the Board some ideas of possible solutions. As Mr. Porter stated earlier, that meeting will be pretty much designed to discuss this issue. The climbing park and Lake Havasu will be two of the three big areas where the agency will have to put in money and get things done from a recreational standpoint over the next five years.

Chairman Stewart asked what the third item was in addition to the climbing park and Lake Havasu.

Mr. Travous responded the third area is Yuma and what needs to be done here.

Mr. Porter stated that is an overview of the discussions that were started at the meeting in Lake Havasu. He was particularly pleased at the attitude of the City.

Chairman Stewart stated it would be helpful to have a tour of the park at Lake Havasu. She requested that it be the day prior to the Board meeting since those Board members who wish to attend the Anza Conference in Yuma will have to leave the meeting immediately after adjournment.

Mr. Porter responded that the Lake Havasu meeting shown on the calendar appears to be a one-day meeting. However, in fact, the City has indicated that they plan to invite the Board to a dinner the night before. He anticipates that the Board will be asked to

come the day before for a tour and attend the dinner.

Mr. Ream reported that it has already been set in motion. There will probably be a tour of the area of Contact Point and then have dinner at Contact Point. There will be plenty of opportunity to see the area and the City will participate in the dinner as well. It will also get the Board to the Law Enforcement point as well.

3. Update on TTC

Mr. Travous reported that the 18th Annual Teamwork and Training Conference was held on the Colorado River again this year. Nominations for awards are generated internally and voted on by a panel of employees. The Employee of the Year was Steve Soroca, Assistant Park Manager at Tonto Natural Bridge State Park. The Team of the Year was People Movers (Jay Ream, Randy Furnish, Joe Mentecki, and Les Gross), a large trailer that can be used all over the state to take people to special events. The Public Service Award and the Award of Excellence both went to Barbie Hart, who is our education person in the Verde River area; she has not only been involved in Verde Birdie, but in the community. The Interpreter of the Year Award went to Anthony Scheirl, one of the park employees at Riordan Mansion. The Customer Service Award went to the Accounting Section staff for all of the things they have been doing regarding all the changes in funding sources and changes in law to keep the rest of staff (their customers) in focus.

Mr. Travous reported that Max Castillo and Ruben Rios received their 30-year pins at that meeting. Next year, if they are still with the agency, two employees will be awarded their 35-year pins. He noted that TTC is the only time everyone in the organization gets together. There were more than 150 people there this year. He believes it is the best thing the agency does for organization communication. People appreciate it.

Chairman Stewart noted that she attended this year and was really impressed. The Board generally hear about the great things employees do one at a time. But, to have all of the awards presented at once and to hear about all of those things made it nice to be associated with ASP and to have the opportunity to hear about some of the really creative things our employees are doing. She believes that the Board would like to congratulate the award winners. The Board realize that the committee that made the selections had a hard job and that there are many people who didn't win awards that also provided outstanding service. She attended some of the sessions and found them to also be very rewarding. She was impressed by the knowledge and professionalism of the staff and the presenters and to learn more about some of the things they are doing. It was a good opportunity for her, as well as a learning experience.

Mr. Porter apologized for not attending. He had planned to attend, but got stuck in a meeting in Kingman that he could not get out of. He noted that, in view of Mr. Travous' report and Ms. Stewart's comments, he believes this is so important that he would like to see staff set the dates for the 2006 TTC as soon as possible and include it on the schedule of Board meetings as though it were a Board meeting with the notation of what it is. He requested that as many Board members as possible put that date on

their calendars with an intention to attend the conference this coming year. It would be an extremely valuable function for as many of the Board members as possible to attend.

Chairman Stewart stated that it was well worth her time. She encouraged any Board member who is able to attend as well. Mr. Hays has attended in the past, and staff appreciated him being there.

Mr. Travous reported that the next TTC will be in August; it's the kick-off of the agency's 50th Anniversary. Staff are awaiting the signing of contracts. It will be in Tucson prior to APRA.

4. Formal Recognition of Site Steward Program – Mary Estes

Chairman Stewart stated that this is the formal recognition of the Site Steward Program and Ms. Mary Estes. Throughout the year the Board has been hearing about all of the national awards that Ms. Estes and the Site Steward Program have received. It is very unusual to have a program win one national award much less three in the same year. It is an outstanding program.

Mr. Travous reported that in 1986 the Arizona Historic Preservation Office and Arizona ASP developed the Site Steward Program, a volunteer-based program designed to assist in the protection of Arizona's cultural resources. Sponsored by state, federal, and public land managers of Arizona and various county and municipal agencies, SHPO, the Archaeology Advisory Commission, the Site Stewards monitor archaeological sites and reports incidents of destruction and vandalism on prehistoric and historic archaeological sites in Arizona. Since its inception, the Arizona Site Steward Program has won a number of awards for dedication, archaeological site protection and public outreach. Most recently, those awards are from the Society of American Archaeologists, the National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers, the National Trust for Historic Preservation. In large part, that is due to someone in the organization who has the focus of the Site Steward Program – Mary Estes. He invited Ms. Estes to the podium. He stated that we are proud to have her in the organization. He noted that at her Site Steward Workshop last year he has a photograph of him bowing down before Ms. Estes. They certainly had a lot of fun that day. He is thankful that the Board is recognizing her as well.

Chairman Stewart noted that for three such prestigious organizations to recognize the program is amazing. She had a few additional facts to add about how important this program is. Ms. Estes is the person running the program. There are 827 Site Stewards currently, although that number may have gone up since she got this information a week ago.

Ms. Estes reported that the number has increased by 26 additional Site Stewards.

Chairman Stewart added that they average 22,000 hours of site monitoring a year on behalf of the citizens of the state. From 2004 to 2005 Site Stewards spend more than 2,000 hours performing public outreach to educate and teach the public about archaeology and destruction of the state's heritage and resources by vandals and looters. She noted that everyone has read about the infamous case in Pinal County where a lessee of the land bulldozed some archaeological sites and co-mingled his goats

with big horn sheep resulting in blindness and death of some of those big horn sheep. That was first brought to the attention of the authorities by one of the Site Stewards in Ms. Estes' program. The Board congratulated Ms. Estes and thanked her for the excellent work she has done on behalf of not only ASP but the entire state of Arizona.

The Board, staff, and audience gave Ms. Estes a standing ovation.

Ms. Estes thanked the Board for the recognition today. She stated that it is great to be recognized by one's peers and members of the ASP Board. It is always nice to be nationally recognized. They are looking forward, hopefully, to possibly being awarded a Preserve America Presidential Award next year.

Mr. Travous noted that staff are not allowed travel out-of-state, so the President will have to come to Arizona to make the presentation.

5. Update on Climbing Park

Mr. Siegwarth reported that things are moving; nothing is conclusive. The federal legislation may happen in December. There is a lot going on in Washington, DC. Staff do not have anything locked in. Staff hope to have a draft Environmental Assessment this week. Many people have already been interviewed and been on-site. Staff are beginning to start proposals for Level III clearances, both in cultural and biological natural resources. Staff are waiting to see how things go before committing the money there. Estimates are that those two studies will cost \$60,000-\$80,000 total. It's a good chunk of money.

Chairman Stewart asked if the Environmental Assessment will include the effect of mining on the air quality at the site should the mine begin operation again. She asked if staff have contacted DEQ.

Mr. Siegwarth responded that the first level Environment Assessment would not be at that detail.

Chairman Stewart stated that she understood that DEQ have quite a bit of information on that since there have been violations in the past. They should have some idea of whether there are problems.

Mr. Siegwarth responded that since it is an SO₂ non-containment area he's been told it will be addressed in the Environmental Assessment. He will receive a draft this week.

Chairman Stewart noted that the agency will have people living there and it's important for the Board to know what kind of environment we would be asking staff to reside in.

Mr. Siegwarth agreed. He stated that staff raised that issue already. Several staff have gone to the site. Staff are currently reviewing a draft of the R&PP Lease. There is a joint meeting scheduled for November 30 with not only Resolution Copper but with staff from the BLM. He and Mr. Ream will also be out there to walk the site. He expects to have more definitive information by the January meeting.

Chairman Stewart asked if the lease includes those provisions Mr. Scalzo discussed.

She asked if they are there.

Mr. Ream responded they are.

6. Update on Revenue and Attendance

Mr. Siegwarth reported that interest rates are good right now if one has money invested. Heritage Fund is doing very well. Staff were expecting about \$750,000 and because there was a carryover \$970,000 was budgeted. Revenues this year will exceed the \$970,000 so it won't be necessary to use that carry forward after all. SLIF revenues are up. Instead of \$7.5 million staff are looking for \$8.1 million, which is split three ways. LESBF should be up to perhaps \$1.5 million. OHV appears to be right on for \$2 million. The big issue is the Enhancement Fund. To break even with the appropriation, a 25.2% increase was needed this year even though we had a record \$9 million last year. It appears there will be, best case, maybe \$10 million, which is an 11.1% increase for the year. In July revenue was up 11.6%. He was very happy. August revenues were down 6%, so we were really up 3% for the year. He was really worried. In September we were down 16% and that caused a lot of stress, but it really wasn't a trend. October revenues were up 1.7%. While it's not a trend to be that far down, year-to-date we are still down about 1.3%. Staff were hoping to be up 11%. We are not in a crisis, but the sky is still pretty cloudy right now. This information has been conveyed to the Governor's Office. There was an article in the paper last week that a lot of places are seeing an increase in Snowbirds over last year. Staff are hopeful they will all come. There are some concerns. He believes we are fine for this fiscal year. Staff have grave concerns for next year. That has been conveyed to the Governor's Office as well. Staff hope to see some help on that in January.

Mr. Siegwarth reported that attendance was up slightly in October – .25%. Year-to-date we are down 6%. That could be explained by many things – gas prices, uncertainty of the hurricanes. When things are uncertain people do not take trips. Staff have hope that things will turn around. He noted that the agency has 30 parks. Their range as far as revenue year-to-date show some parks up as high as 58%; one park's visitation is up 71%; the lake parks are doing exceedingly well. There are some parks that are down 27% and 43%. When it's all put together, there are some parks performing very strongly. Staff are hopeful that Catalina and a couple of other parks will have a great year through the development that has been done. Some of the parks that are doing poorly like Homolovi can be attributed to the broken water main and lack of water for a couple of months. It is premature to get too excited. He is not as concerned as he was last month. He just got the October numbers yesterday, so he is a little more comfortable.

Chairman Stewart asked if an additional budget request was submitted to the Governor's Office to include the climbing park and DEQ requirements.

Mr. Siegwarth responded that the Governor has very strict guidelines on the budget process. We have a two-year budget that includes 2007. He only has the ability to request increased funds if he can demonstrate a need for a supplemental, which is a very legalistic process that involves the Speaker of the House, the President of the Senate, and the Governor saying we will have to write a bad check. Outside the

budgetary process (the formal one), staff have been dealing with the Governor's Office very closely on revenue estimates and potential issues and how they can be resolved. As part of that, there have been discussions about the agency's capital needs in general. Regarding the agency's priorities, DEQ is clearly the number one priority on the capital needs list. Staff also raised the climbing park as a great example of since the population is growing so should our operational opportunities and under-serving a huge demographic of Arizonans – the 18-35 year-old age group. They are very receptive. They have all that information.

Chairman Stewart asked if staff can provide the Board with a copy of that packet so when they go to budget hearings in January there will have been an opportunity to review that information.

Mr. Siegwarth responded that he will be happy to provide that information to the Board. Most of the information is already in the budget book.

Chairman Stewart responded that she did not believe all of the information was included. It is helpful any time there is additional information provided to the Governor or the legislature that the Board receives that written information as well so if they run into someone they don't get blindsided. The Board never know when they might run into someone and be in a position to help out by putting in a plug for something. If they don't know what the figures are, they are not in a good position to be helpful.

Mr. Travous noted that, on this issue, he is the person who looks at the glass as half empty. He is usually the one who sees it as half-full. He is worried about the revenue. If we were looking at being up 11% and are down, that's a swing of 12%. We are running out of months to make that up. Mr. Siegwarth is unusually calm about this; he is worried about it.

H. EXECUTIVE SESSION – Upon a public majority vote, the Board may hold an Executive Session which is not open to the public for the following purposes:

- 1. To discuss or consult with its legal counsel for legal advice on matters listed on this agenda pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03 (A)(3), including:**
 - a. Mabery Easement Dispute Litigation**
- 2. To discuss or consult with its legal counsel in order to consider its position and instruct its attorneys regarding the Board's position regarding contracts that are the subject of negotiations, in pending or contemplated litigation or in settlement discussions conducted in order to avoid or resolve litigation pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03 (A)(4)**
 - a. Mabery Easement Dispute Litigation**

Ms. Hernbrode stated that there is no need for an Executive Session on this issue.

I. ACTION ITEMS FROM EXECUTIVE SESSION

- 1. Mabery Easement Dispute Litigation**

Ms. Hernbrode stated she needed to make a brief announcement. She is dismayed and embarrassed to tell this Board that the judge in the Mabery matter has ordered Mr. Jim Morrow, the other attorney on the case, and her to appear before him on December 19, 2005, at 4:00 p.m. and show cause why he should not rule them in contempt. She reassured the Board that every attorney she has discussed this with, including all the way up the chain at the Attorney General's (AG's) Office, has assured her that what they did was not Contempt of Court. However, it is an issue of concern. The AG's Office will be providing a third attorney to represent them. This does not affect the Board's rights in any way; it does reflect this judge's idea of their case.

Chairman Stewart noted that it seems to be a continuation of the pattern of decisions. Having worked in the AG's Office for 22 years she can say that it's highly irregular and unusual for a judge to suggest that that would be grounds for contempt. New things happen all the time.

Ms. Hernbrode explained that Mr. Morrow and she did not realize that a State Statute prevented the State from paying jury fees and costs. When the judge wrote the proposed Order, they did not object to it. When they realized their mistake, they informed the Court that the State was not able to pay jury fees and costs. He did grant their Motion and agreed with them that they were correct on that issue of law. However, he is apparently upset that they did not realize it earlier.

Chairman Stewart responded that, normally, contempt is reserved for intentional misdeeds and misconduct and deliberate omissions as opposed to one that was inadvertent.

Ms. Hernbrode stated that she hoped when they explained that to this judge he would agree with the Chairman.

Mr. Porter noted that both he and Mr. Hays have decided to probably go and sit in the audience during that hearing to, if nothing else, give moral support.

Mr. Scalzo asked if this is a county Superior Court.

Ms. Hernbrode responded it is the Superior Court in Yavapai County in Prescott.

Mr. Porter stated that part of his and Mr. Hays' concern is that they anticipate that there will probably be press coverage at that hearing. They want to at least be available if needed to provide a little more balanced discussion considering the parties who might be in attendance.

Chairman Stewart asked that they heed the advice of the counsel regarding whether they should say anything.

Mr. Porter noted that if it were going to be evenly handled by the other side, he would ordinarily not say anything. They have a feeling that there may be an attempt to generate some negative publicity.

J. CALL TO THE PUBLIC

There was no public present at this time.

K. TIME AND PLACE OF NEXT MEETING AND CALL FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

- 1. Staff recommends that the next Arizona State Parks Board Meeting be held in Phoenix, AZ on January 19, 2006.**

Chairman Stewart stated that the next Board meeting will be in Phoenix on January 19, 2006 at 9:00 a.m.

Chairman Stewart stated that she asked Mr. Travous to invite the Director of Game and Fish Commission and the Chairman and any of their Commissioners who would like to meet with the Parks Board to discuss how the two can work together. It might be helpful to discuss Watchable Wildlife.

Chairman Stewart stated that she invited Mr. Pat Graham from The Nature Conservancy to present a short video on the Verde Greenway which includes appearances by Mr. Hays and Mr. Castillo who are prominently featured. It is a nice video that will be a nice tool to use as the Board pursues acquisition of more properties in that area.

Chairman Stewart reported she attended the Conservation Summit. One of the interesting presentations was by Jeff Williams of the Phoenix Zoo. He talked about the difficulties of organizations engaging young people in nature with all of the cell phones. He is doing a couple of projects and has a 10-minute presentation that the Board would be interested in having on the Agenda as well.

Chairman Stewart added that it might be time to have an update on land acquisition priorities. The Board was going to have a contract with the Foundation and a list of priorities on this meeting's Agenda, but Ms. Statler was unable to be in attendance. She would like to roll that over to the next meeting.

Mr. Porter added the Board should look at where things stand on the proposed contract with the Foundation. It's been pending for quite a while. He believes the Board really needs to have an agreement with them. He would also like to see an update on the status of negotiations with the AHS on trying to get an agreement of some type in place.

L. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Scalzo made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Porter seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 12:08 p.m.

Pursuant to Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), Arizona State Parks does not discriminate on the basis of a disability regarding admission to public meetings. Persons with a disability may request a reasonable accommodation, such as a sign language interpreter, by contacting the ADA Coordinator, Nicole Armstrong-Best, (602) 542-7152; or TTY (602) 542-4174. Requests should be made as early as possible to allow time to arrange the accommodation.

SUBMITTED BY:

Kenneth E. Travous, Executive Director

APPROVED BY:

Elizabeth Stewart, Chairman